

J. Bellie

THE
CONDITION
AND
EXAMPLE
OF OUR
BLESSED SAVIOUR
VINDICATED:
IN
ANSWER
TO THE
Bishop of *BANGOR*'s
CHARGE of CALUMNY
Against the
Dean of *CHICHESTER*.

By *THO. SHERLOCK*, D.D. Dean of
Chichester, and Master of the *Temple*.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. PEMBERTON at the *Buck and Sun*,
over against St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleet-*
street. 1718.

2

1

1871

1872

1873

1874

1875

1876



*The Condition and Example
of our Blessed Saviour vin-
dicated, &c.*



Hou'd I pretend to say that I received his Lordship's *denunciation* in the News Paper of a *Charge of Calumny*, without concern; I should deny the truth: For tho' I well knew that I had given no just occasion for so foul an imputation, yet I knew also that his Lordship's kind endeavours to blacken my reputation, would not be altogether ineffectual.

Indeed, I was much affected with it, and am so still; tho' his Lordship's declaration of the *Reasons* of his *Charge*, have afforded me a great deal of comfort; and I rejoice to find that the ground of all the *bad* things his Lordship has to say of me, is, that I *quoted* a Passage out of a Book of his; and shewed

how much I disliked it; which it seems had been quiet and unmolested for *seven Years**.

Calumny, Reproach, Noise, Dirt, Scandal, Defamation, and the like words, require more *Art* to range them *decently* in Controversy, than I am master of; and therefore I never intend to make use of them to any Person, much less to his Lordship: And instead of returning any such words, I shall content my self with shewing, that I did not deserve any such.

At the close of the *Vindication*, &c. I observed that his Lordship had endeavoured to *write down* (or to diminish, as I likewise express it) *the Religion of Oaths*; and for this *only reason, because it stood in his way*. I go on to say; *a reason which has often carried his Lordship into great extremes*. Of this I give an instance in these words.

“ I remember once, when he was urged
 “ (in a dispute about Government) with the
 “ *example* of our blessed Saviour’s suffering
 “ as applied by St. *Peter*, he made no scruple to affirm — *That the example of our*
 “ *Lord is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to SLAVES — than to SUBJECTS* †. A

* *Answer to a Calumny*, pag. 9.
 Dr. Atterbury, pag. 65.

† *Answer to*

“ Doctrine which will make the ears of a
 “ *Christian* tingle; and ought to make him
 “ read with caution a Writer so fond of his
 “ own notions, as to take *such* steps to de-
 “ fend them.

Upon these words his Lordship fixes his charge of *Calumny*. Now if it shall appear, that this is a proper instance of the thing charged on the Bishop; that the words quoted from his Lordship are his own words, and make an entire assertion or proposition of themselves; and make the *whole* of *his* assertion; that nothing is left out that can alter the assertion, or make it other than it appears to be; then I hope the world will acquit me of the Charge of *Calumny*; and I trust the warmth of any expression used upon this occasion may be excused by the nature of the Proposition I had under consideration, and the dishonour done by it to our blessed Lord and Master.

I will shew the Reader then:

1. That the instance was proper: I shall give his Lordship's own account of the *occasion* of his assertion. His words are these:

“ The *occasion* of it was this. This *Ar-*
 “ *gument* from St. *Peter*'s exhorting Slaves
 “ to be subject to their Masters, *not only to*
 “ *the kind but to the froward*, was urged
 “ as implying in it the Duty of *Subjects*,
 “ with

“ with respect to their *Civil Rights*; and
 “ the *example* of our *Blessed Saviour* being
 “ by St. *Peter* propos'd to *Slaves*, it was
 “ declared that this example of Christ belongs
 “ more, or is more peculiarly fit to be urg'd,
 “ to *Subjects*, than to *Slaves*; in order to
 “ press the Duty of *Passive Obedience* upon
 “ them. *Ans.* to Dr. *Atterbury*, p. 54. After
 “ many other considerations, I add, particu-
 “ larly in answer to this latter allegation, the
 “ following *passage*, p. 64, 65, 66.

His Lordship here says, that *after* many
other considerations, he added the following
 passage: *i. e.* the passage which contains the
proposition I quoted; and *his* Lordship's *proofs*
 of it. This is in truth the case: His Lord-
 ship had answered, that *the example* (of
 Christ) *is very proper to be recommended to*
Superiors as well as Inferiors, to Kings and
Masters, as well as to Subjects and Slaves,
 p. 63. And that *the manner*, and *not the*
matter of our suffering is to be taken from
the example of our Lord, *i. e.* That the ex-
 ample of our Lord's sufferings, is proper* for
 all Christians in their several tryals and affli-
 ctions; that it belongs to them as Christians,
 and not as considered under the relations of
 King and Subject, of Master and Servant; and
 consequently that the example of Christ can-
 not

not be urged to limit or adjust the rights flowing from such relations. Thus his Lordship had answered, and had his Lordship stopped here he wou'd have given no offence; but not content with this, he *presses on*, and in the *true spirit* of opposition asserts the *very contrary* (tho' he had no occasion so to do) to what was objected to him; and affirms, p. 64. *It is so far from being true, that his example was more peculiarly fit to be recommended to Subjects, considered as such, than to Slaves; that I think the VERY CONTRARY to be evident.* And after producing some of *his* reasons which moved him *so* to think; he says, *I cannot forbear* (I am sorry he cou'd not) making the *two following observations*: the second of which observations is in these very words; *And likewise, that the example of our Lord is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves, by whose condition he is pleased frequently to describe his own low estate; than to SUBJECTS whose condition is never used to that purpose, and whom he is never said to personate in his lowest and most oppressed condition,* p. 65.

I have stated the case, as I truly think, with all fairness; and I desire the Reader to judge, whether this be not an instance of his Lordship's running into *Extreams* out of opposition:

position? Can any one think, that if his Lordship had been considering the example of Christ's sufferings, without an *objection* drawn from it *against* his *own* doctrine, that he could possibly have come to say; *That Christ's example is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves—than to Subjects?* For my own part I do not believe this of his Lordship; and as I placed it at first to the account of the *extreme opposition* to his Adversary; so do I still place it to the same account; and it is therefore, as I conceive, a proper instance, and comes up fully to the point for which 'tis mentioned.

2. That the words quoted by me are his Lordship's *own* words: This is not denied.

3. That as they make an entire assertion or proposition of themselves, so do they contain truly the whole of what he asserts, exclusive of his reasons for it: The proposition which his Lordship was to confute, as expressed by himself, was this; *That the example of Christ was more peculiarly fit to be recommended to Subjects, considered as such, than to Slaves—*and he says, that he *thinks the very contrary to be evident*. The *contrary* proposition then was what his Lordship was to *maintain*, and *that* is fully expressed in the words by me quoted; and the words
which

which I omitted make *no part* of the *contra-*
ry proposition. From whence 'tis plain, that
 I have given the *entire* assertion and propo-
 sition which his Lordship *professed* to main-
 tain; and *entirely* in his *own* words, without
 adding to, or subtracting from, the propo-
 sition which he *undertook* to justify: that pro-
 position which his Lordship laid down at
 the beginning of Paragraph 10. (and is now
 transcribed into his answer) and which he la-
 bours to maintain to the end of that long pa-
 ragraph.

4. There is nothing left out (in my quota-
 tion) that can alter the assertion, or make it
 other than it appears to be.

The words *left* out in *my* quotation, con-
 tain the *reasons* given by his Lordship for the
 assertion. A reason brought to *support* a
 proposition cannot *alter* the nature of the
 proposition, or *make* it *other* than it is in it
 self: and therefore his Lordship must not say,
 that the proposition *quoted* in *his own* words;
 is not *his* proposition, because I did not quote
his reasons in support of it. The proposition
 is the *same*, and *expresses* the *same* thing,
 whether the reasons be added, or not added.
 I never before heard that there was any *Ca-*
lummy in *quoting* or *reporting* a man's princi-
 ples, or assertions, tho' you did not, at the
 B same

same time, *report* his *reasons* for them. Indeed the reasons which his Lordship *himself* has now produced to the world; are so far from satisfying even *himself*, that he seems not willing to *rest* the cause upon them; but has given such an interpretation of his words quoted by *me*, as is inconsistent with the common use of language, and with common sense. I will insert the paragraph entire where his Lordship comes to the pinch of the case.

“ I hope it is not too shocking to the ears
 “ of a *Christian Dean*, to affirm that the ex-
 “ *ample* of *Christ* is *very fit* to be propos'd
 “ to *Slaves*, in order to engage them to bear
 “ the *unavoidable evils* of their unhappy
 “ condition, with patience and resignation:
 “ because the *Apostles* themselves have done
 “ this. And I beg to know the great difference
 “ between saying that this is *fit*, and
 “ *proper*, in the *positive* degree; and saying,
 “ in the *comparative*, that this is *more pecu-*
 “ *liarly fit* than to propose it to *Civil Sub-*
 “ *jects*, considered as such.”

His Lordship's defence here turns upon this, that there is *no great difference* between saying *positively*, that the *example of Christ* is *fit and proper to be proposed to Slaves*; and saying, by way of comparison, that it is
 (much)

(much) *more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves, than to Subjects.* His Lordship can see no great *difference*, and I profess I can see very little similitude between the two assertions. He that says, *it is very fit to be proposed to Slaves*, says what is very true; but he that says, *it is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves than Subjects*, says what will appear to be very false; and I must still say, very shocking to a Christian. The example of Christ was not purposed to, or fitted for *any one sort* of men more than another; but it is recommended to all as *Christians*: It was as proper to be urged to King Charles the First, in his days of distress, as ever it was to the meanest Slave in the Roman Empire; for tho', as his Lordship observes, our Saviour *appeared in a low and afflicted condition*, yet he descended from the *highest and most glorious* state; and consequently, his example is equally fit for the *highest* of the sons of men in their affliction, and for the *lowest*. How comes his Lordship then, at p. 65. to affirm, *That it is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves than Subjects.* Is not the Bishop sensible this cannot be defended, when he tells us, there is no great difference between this assertion, and saying, *That the example of Christ is fit to*

be proposed to Slaves? I desire his Lordship would try these two ways of speaking in any other case, and see whether they amount to one and the same thing. Let us try them in a case in which his Lordship is concerned: He tells us often, that every Christian has a right to interpret the Scripture. Suppose then that I should tell his Lordship, that it is his sense, *That it is fit and proper for the weakest men to interpret Scripture*; he would perhaps allow the consequence; but should I tell him, that he appears to me to affirm, *That it is much more peculiarly fit for the weakest men to interpret Scripture, than for the wisest and most learned*; I am afraid he would complain of very ill usage; and yet why should he, if there be no great difference between these two forms of expression? 'Tis plain then, that however his Lordship in his *anger* charges me with *Calumny* for quoting his words; yet he himself, after all he can say for them, is not willing to abide by them: and would have the Reader believe, that there is no great difference between saying, *That the example of Christ is fit to be proposed to Slaves*: and, *That it is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves—than to Subjects*. He that says it is fit for Slaves, may say also 'tis equally fit for Subjects; but he
that

that says 'tis *peculiarly* fit for Slaves, does imply that there is some degree of unfitness in it with respect to Subjects. And what can I do in this case, but appeal to the *common* sense of *mankind*. I am willing to put the cause upon this issue, upon which his Lordship has put it: If there appears no great difference between the two assertions, then am I to be charged; but, in truth, rather with *want* of *sense* than with the guilt of *Calumny*: But if these two expressions do greatly differ, then let others judge what his Lordship is guilty of in charging me with *Calumny* for reminding him of his own words; words, which, he has too much *sense*, to *defend*, and, too little *ingenuity*, to *retract*.

What his Lordship confesses at p. 16. That he has affirmed, *that our blessed Lord's example is more peculiarly fit to be proposed to the low, poor and distressed part of mankind, than to the fortunate and rich*, may be true, and yet it will be very wrong and *shocking* in any one to affirm, that the example of Christ is *much more peculiarly fit to be urged to a Beggar than to a Gentleman*. But in truth this confession of his Lordship appears to me to be a *mere fallacy*; if he means that an *example of patient suffering* is more fit to be urged to those who *do suffer*,
than

than to those *who do not* ; he speaks a great truth, but nothing to the present purpose: If he means that our Lord's example is more proper to the poor in *their* sufferings, than to the rich in *their* sufferings; he speaks to his purpose indeed, but the assertion is what every Christian must reject. So in the same Page, when he says, *this is more peculiarly fit to be proposed to persons in a low condition*; he imposes on his reader, for the *greatest* persons may be in a low condition, as well as the *meanest*: He ought to have said (not *in* but) *of* a low condition; and then the assertion would have been fairly to his purpose, but false in itself; for the example of Christ is fit for persons *of* all conditions, and equally fit for Kings, Subjects, and Slaves; when they suffer wrongfully. For with respect to Slaves themselves, when they are kindly used by their Masters, and treated with equity and humanity, and suffer nothing by ill usage whilst they do their duty, so long the example of Christ's Sufferings is not *peculiarly* fit for their *condition*; and when they do suffer *wrongfully*, the example belongs to them not as *Slaves*, but as *Christians* suffering for Righteousness sake.

As to what his Lordship says, *p. 17.* of his having in his answer to Dr. A. *explained* the example

example of Christ in a *proper* manner ; I never said he had not ; nor do I now say it. But *this* I have said, and *this* I still say, that not content to *explain* it *properly* and *justly*, he was *carried* in the heat of his opposition to a great *extreme* ; and could not leave the cause when he had made (as he says) a *proper* answer ; but would go on till he came to the *very contrary* (to use his own words) to what had been objected to him : And because it had been said that the example of Christ (as his Lordship represents his Adversaries words, which I have not before me) *belongs more to Subjects than to Slaves*, therefore his Lordship would not leave the argument until he had affirmed ; *That the example of Christ is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves than to Subjects*. And this, I think, was, being *carried into a very great extreme*.

I do not pretend here to consider the argument of his Lordship's learned Adversary, or the reasons given by him for the support of his opinion : I take the whole upon the Bishop's own representation of the case ; and find enough to justify what I said, *that he was carried into great extremes*, through opposition.

I presume I have said enough to *justify* the *fairness* of my quotation ; but his Lordship
has

has more complaints; and is very *angry* with me, for saying, that *his* assertion *will make the ears of a Christian tingle*: To do justice therefore to my self against his Lordship's *violent* recrimination; I will go on to shew that *his* assertion is as bad, as those words of mine represent it to be, and that he has neither *Scripture* nor *Reason* to support him in it.

And first I will shew the Reader what *the assertion* amounts to, by giving his Lordship's explications of the terms of *his* proposition: By *Slaves* then he means *Slaves properly so called* *; *i. e.* such as are *bought in the market*, or *taken captive* †. By *Subjects*, he means, such as have Civil Rights and Properties, and are not bound by the mere will of their Kings; as *Slaves* are, who are *bought and sold in the market*. I suppose I need not refer to any particular passages to prove this to be his sense of the word *Subject*.

The proposition which his Lordship had to answer was, according to his own account ‡ this. The example of Christ *is more peculiarly fit to be recommended to Subjects, considered as such, than to Slaves*: He undertakes to maintain the *very contrary* to be true: The pro-

* Answer to Dr. A. p. 55. & 59.

† Ibid. p. 54, & 59.

‡ Pag. 64.

position then which he affirms is this : *That the example of our Lord is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves (considered as such) than to Subjects considered as such.* i.e. The example of our Lord is much more fit for such as *are bought and sold in markets*, than for such as have *Civil Rights and Properties*. This assertion is very shocking to a Christian, as being highly *dishonourable* to our blessed Saviour. And one of the Bishop's reasons for *this* assertion; viz. *That the New Testament — represents the humiliation and low estate of Christ — by the condition of Slaves: i.e. of such Slaves as are bought and sold in the market*, is equally bad, equally dishonourable to our blessed Saviour, as will soon appear.

But to take *his* reasons for his assertion in their order, as they are now set forth in his Answer. The first is: *That St. Peter expressly proposes the example of our blessed Lord to Slaves* *. To which I answer, that this may be true, and yet nothing to his Lordship's purpose: For 'tis *one* thing, *expressly to propose the example of Christ to Slaves*, and *another* to propose it as *much more peculiarly fit for Slaves, than for*

Subjects. Should a Physician *expressly* prescribe the Jesuits Bark for a *Servant* who has an Ague; would his Lordship infer that *Jesuits Bark* is much more peculiarly fit for a *Servant's* Ague, than for a *Master's*? I think he would not: And therefore what he says of the example as proposed by St. Peter, comes not near his point.

Besides, St. Peter does not speak of *Slaves* peculiarly in his Lordship's sense of the word, but of domesticks of all sorts; he calls them not δᾶλοι, but οἰκέται; not *Slaves*, but *Domesticks*; tho' he had just before used the word δᾶλῳ, declaring Christians of all ranks to be δᾶλοι Θεῷ, *Servants of God*; and he calls the Masters not Κύριοι but δεσπόται, that is οἰκοδεσπόται, Masters of families: If his Lordship had consulted only Stephens his *Thesaurus*, he would have found, that οἰκέται are not peculiarly *Slaves*, but according to Hesych. οἱ κατὰ τὸ οἶκον πάντες; according to Suidas; ἔ μόνον οἱ ἐξ ἐξοπῶντες ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ κατὰ τὸ οἶκον: not only *servants*, but all that belong to the family: that an old Grammarian quoted by Eustat. says, οἰκέτας vocatos fuisse non solum τὰς κατὰ ἀγρὰς ὑπεργὰς, not only *Slaves* tyed to hard labour in the Countrey, sed etiam τὰς ἐν οἰκίαις ἐλευθέρους, but also the *freemen* belonging to the family: And under the word οἰκῶς he would have

have seen this account of the word from *Eustat.*

ἀνάκειται, οἱ καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν διαλέγοντες, καὶ ἔιν ἐλεύθεροι. *Such as belong to the family tho' they are free.*

1. He that considers this account of the word, will, I believe, see sufficient reason why the example proposed by St. *Peter* ought not to be confined to *Slaves properly so called*. And had St. *Peter* used the word δούλος, I shall shew that even that word could not reasonably have been confined to such *Slaves*. For ought then that appears to the contrary, St. *Peter* did not peculiarly speak to *Slaves* in the sense in which his Lordship understands the word. But,

2. Suppose he did speak to such *Slaves*; yet 'tis certain that he does not propose the example of Christ to them, as *peculiarly fit for them* considered as *Slaves*: He thus exhorts them; *Servants be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward*. At v. 19. he gives them a reason why they should so do; but even this reason is *general*, and not *peculiarly fit for Slaves*. His words are: *For this is thank worthy (εὐχαριστία) if any man (not if any Slave) for conscience toward God endure grief suffering wrongfully: and that 'tis suffering wrongfully while they do well, and not merely as Slaves that is the*

acceptable thing to God, the next verse shews. And when he comes at *ŷ. 21.* to propose the example of Christ, the reasons he gives why the example of Christ should be followed, are such as affect all men equally, and have nothing in them *peculiar* to Slaves: *for even hereunto are ye called: i.e.* to suffer patiently, when it shall be your lot, in well-doing; which is a reason to all Christians; for St. Paul speaking (not to Slaves) but to the *Servants of Jesus Christ at Philppi with the Bishops and Deacons*, tells them, Ch. i. *ŷ. 29.* *Unto you it is given on the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake.* St. Peter goes on: *bccause Christ also suffered for us.* If this be a good reason for imitating his example, 'tis good to all, for Christ suffered not for *Slaves peculiarly*, but for *all the sons of men*: And in like manner the argument goes on upon general topicks to the end of the Chapter; and the last verse shews how St. Peter applied the example, and under what character he considered those to whom he applied it; for thus he speaks to them, *for ye were as sheep going astray, but now are returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls*: Now then ye who were gone astray, &c. were not peculiarly Slaves, but include the Christians of all sorts,

forts, whether Subjects or Slaves. But if his Lordship's reason be good, St. Peter's argument must stand thus; *This is thank-worthy if a man (i.e. a Slave) for conscience toward God endure grief: for what glory is it if when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye (Slaves) take it patiently, but if when ye do well and suffer for it, ye (Slaves) take it patiently, this is acceptable to God; for even hereunto were ye (Slaves peculiarly) called, because Christ also suffered for us, (Slaves peculiarly) v. 21. Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree. That we (Slaves) being dead to sin should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye (Slaves) were healed, v. 24. for ye, (Slaves peculiarly) were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.* So that if the example of Christ be *peculiarly* here applied to *Slaves*, it must be because he is *peculiarly Bishop of the Souls of Slaves*.

Thus you see what extravagant Absurdities follow from supposing St. Peter to recommend the example of Christ as *peculiarly fit for Slaves*.

3. In the following Chapter, St. Peter after considering the duty of *Wives* to their *Husbands*, and of *Husbands* to *Wives*, at
 v. 8.

Ÿ. 8. speaks to *all sorts* of Christians in general: *finally be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another——not rendring evil for evil, or railing for railing, but contrarywise blessing*, Ÿ. 9. In the following verses he proposes to them the advantages that such gentle behaviour will yield even in this life; and at Ÿ. 14. tells them, *But and if ye suffer for righteousness sake, happy are ye*: and at the 18th Ÿ. he proposes to all the example of Christ, *for Christ also hath once suffered, the just for the unjust*. At Chap. iv. Ÿ. 1. he again makes a general application of the example to all Christians: *Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm your selves likewise with the same mind*. Now he that proposed the example of Christ's sufferings to all sorts of Christians in *this* manner, cou'd not possibly propose it *as much more peculiarly fit for Slaves than for Subjects*.

His Lordship's third reason for his assertion is in these words, * *That in mentioning and handling the Duty of Subjects, considered as Civil Subjects, neither he, (St. Peter) nor any other Apostle, ever once proposes the example of Christ's passive submission and non-resistance.*

* Pag. 13. Ans. to a Cal.

Allowing this to be true; yet I cannot see what his Lordship gets by it: if the example of Christ was not proposed to Subjects, as such; will it follow, that it is *much more peculiarly fit for Slaves, than for Subjects?* if 'tis not *peculiarly fit for Subjects*, must it needs therefore be *peculiarly fit for Slaves?* So that his Lordship's assertion is neither *proved*, nor *qualified* in any degree, by this observation, supposing it to be entirely right. But in truth, the example of Christ's sufferings is proposed just as much to *Subjects*, considered as such; as it is to *Slaves*, considered as such. His Lordship (here) lays very great stress upon this; that the example of Christ is by St. *Peter* connected immediately to the case of *Slaves*, which can signify little to his cause, since all the reasons given by St. *Peter* to enforce the example are such, as equally concern all, whether Slaves or not; and in the very next chapter the *example* is expressly proposed to all: It had been most certainly a very invidious thing for the Apostles directly to have said, that Governours would be injurious to their Subjects, and might have drawn upon Christians the indignation and wrath of the powers of the world: For this reason St. *Peter* seems purposely to avoid (as St. *Paul* does likewise) putting the case of
unjust

unjust Princes; and does with great address put the case of *hard* and *ill* usage, with respect to Masters, which is immediately subjoined to what he says to Subjects; and then proposes the example of Christ, and urges it with such reasons as he knew wou'd reach *every* Christian's case suffering *wrongfully*, whether it were under the oppression of a *Prince*, or of a *Master*. I am the more inclined to think that this was really his design, from observing how *St. Peter* conducts himself in speaking to Christian Subjects, Chap. ii. and Chap. iii. Having largely treated of the Duty of Subjects from *Y. 13.* to *Y. 17.* inclusively: he throws in the case of Servants and hard Masters in one single verse; and goes immediately to the example of Christ, and urges it to the end of the Chapter, upon reasons common to all sorts of Christians: which makes it probable, that he chose to speak of Servants in *this* place, on purpose that he might propose the case of unjust suffering, and yet without expressly applying to Magistrates, so as to give offence: This I say, is probable; especially considering, That in the third Chapter he speaks expressly to *all* sorts of Christians, and puts the case of *their suffering for righteousness sake*; but then having mentioned their suffering wrongfully, he

he *industriously* avoids mentioning of Magistrates at the same time ; and when he exhorts Christians not to fear those who might so evilly entreat them, he names no person ; but gives a *relative* without an *antecedent*, rather than he wou'd name Civil Governours ; But and if (says he) *ye suffer for righteousness sake, happy are ye :* τὸ ἔλεος αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθήτε *and be not afraid of their terror :* of whose terror ? Look back, and you will find no persons mentioned to whom the word *their* can refer ; and the Apostle seems to me on purpose to suppress the mention of them, that he might not offend ; for that he had the Civil Powers in his Eye, is pretty plain, from *Ch. 4. 15.* *But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a busy body in other mens affairs, ὡς ἀλλοτρίοις ἐπισκοποῦντες, as a Spy, or Pryer into matters in which he is not concerned ; and the word as properly signify medlers in politics, as in private affairs :* Now pray consider under what power, and from what hands, do men *suffer* as murderers, as thieves, &c. private men do not punish for robbery or murder, but Magistrates do : can it then be supposed, that St. Peter had not Magistrates in his view when he said this ? He adds in the next verse, *Yet if any man suffer as a Christian,*

D

stian, let him not be ashamed. To suffer as a Christian, is to suffer for being a Christian, and for rejecting and despising the common and professed Idolatry; and punishment on this account was not administered by private persons, but by Magistrates; and therefore St. *Peter*, speaking of the sufferings of Christians, Chap. iii. and iv. had regard to their suffering under the Civil Powers; and yet, Chap. iii. v. 18. he does expressly *apply the example of Christ's sufferings to this case.* Not indeed to prove that the Magistrate had a right to injure Christians, but to shew Christians how they ought to bear the calamities, which they suffered wrongfully. And the very same application belongs to Slaves: for the example of Christ recommended even to them, does not (as his Lordship confesses *) prove that they may in no case seek a remedy; but it shews them how to bear with patience the miseries which they endure for righteousness sake, or without deserving them. And let any man now consider the case, and tell me, what cou'd carry his Lordship into so strange an assertion as this, *That the example of Christ is much more peculiarly fit for Slaves than Subjects?* I know but of one thing

* *Ans. to Dr. A. p. 63.*

that can be said to this, *viz.* That possibly St. *Peter* might write this with an eye to the Jews, under whose malice sometimes the Christians suffered as Christians. But that cou'd not be the case here ; for St. *Peter* writes to the Christians of the dispersion, *τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις*, to the *Strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia*; Countries, where the Jews had no power to put their malice in execution ; and therefore they cou'd not be intended by the Apostle ; and there was no Power, but the Civil Power, to which the Apostle cou'd refer, with respect to all these Countries ; for that he did not speak of private malice, or private injuries, has been already shewn.

Nor is it any wonder that St. *Peter* shou'd apply the example of Christ, to Christians suffering under the Civil Powers for righteousness sake, when our Saviour himself had so applied it before him : In the 10th of St. *Matthew* our Blessed Lord sends forth the Twelve to preach, and tells them, *Ÿ. 18. Ye shall be brought before Governours and Kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles :* and after describing to them many circumstances of the persecution they were to undergo, he adds, *Ÿ. 24, 25, 26. The Disciple is not above his Master, nor the*

*Servant above his Lord; it is enough for the Disciple that he be as his Master, and the Servant as his Lord: If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household: Fear them not therefore: and at v. 28. he says, Fear not them which kill the body, &c. In the 24th of St. Matthew, in the 13th of St. Mark, and 21st of St. Luke, he tells them, they shall be delivered up to the synagogues, and into prisons, being brought before Kings and Rulers for his names sake—and exhorts them—to possess their souls in patience. In the 15th of St. John our Lord is upon the same subject; and there expressly sets his own example before his Disciples; *If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you, v. 18. Remember the word that I said unto you, The Servant is not greater than the Lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; v. 20. And at Chap. xvi. v. 33. he thus encourages them: In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.**

Thus you see our Saviour proposes his example to such as were not *Slaves*; to such as were to suffer under the power of *Kings and Rulers*: not to justify Rulers in their abusing Christians; but

but to arm Christians with patience when they suffer wrongfully ; and shall we now ; after having seen that Christ himself proposes his example to Christians of all ranks, and who were to suffer from civil powers ; say with his Lordship, *That the example of Christ is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves than to Subjects?* I hope I have said enough upon this head, to make his Lordship re-consider, what he seems to affirm, that the *example of Christ's sufferings*, is never proposed in Scripture to *Subjects*, and always to *Slaves*.

His Lordships third reason is, “ 3. That “ the *New Testament* it self represents the “ humiliation, and low estate of *Christ* in “ *this* world, by the condition of *Slaves*, “ the lowest and most helpless part of man- “ kind ; and never once by the low estate, or “ helpless condition of *Civil Subjects*, as “ such : which would have been, had *they* “ been put, in the *New Testament*, in the “ same *circumstances* with *Slaves*.”

By the condition of Slaves: Slaves you must remember are, in his Lordship's sense, *such as are bought and sold in markets* for the service of their Masters : and I do affirm, that the Scripture never *thus* represents the low estate of Christ. I will begin with desir-
ring

ring the Reader to consider a passage in *St. John*, because our Saviour is there *pressing* his *own example* in one of the *most servile* things that ever he did, upon *all* his Disciples. In the 13th of *St. John* we read, that our Saviour *rising from supper laid aside his garments, and took a towel and girded himself; then poured water into a bason, and washed his Disciples feet, and wiped them with the towel wherewith he was girded.* Here, if ever, we might expect to find our Saviour's *low estate* represented by the *condition* of a *Slave*; but we shall find nothing less: This history is introduced by the Apostle with an express declaration of the great power and dignity of our Saviour, *Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God, &c. &c. &c.* 3. *He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments, and took a towel, &c.* 4.—and after the work was over, our blessed Saviour, in applying *this very example* to his Disciples, begins with reminding them of his own superiority over them: *Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am, &c.* 13. Is this like one whose estate the Scripture is to represent by the condition of a Slave? But let's hear the rest: *If I then your Lord and Master have washed your feet,*

feet, ye ought also to wash one anothers feet, *Ÿ. 14.* The reason of which is expressed at *Ÿ. 16.* *Verily verily I say unto you, the servant is not greater than his lord, neither he that is sent, greater than he that sent him. i. e.* If I the greatest among you have not thought it below me to condescend to wash your feet; let none of you who are confessedly my inferiours, think much to do the same office of love and humility: So that this example of our Lord in so *servile* an employment, is so far from being founded in a representation of his estate by the condition of a Slave, that it is really inconsistent with it: For one who was to personate a Slave in washing of other's feet, though he might recommend his example of *patience*, and *submission* to his *duty*, yet he could not say as our Lord does; consider, what the *greatest* among you has done; what I your *Lord* and *Master* have done, not as *bound in duty* to you *my servants*, but out of love and humility, and never think it *below* you to do likewise. This is an exhortation not fit for a *Slave* to make; a *Slave* cannot urge his *great* love or *great* humility in doing what his condition requires of him, nor can he plead his example as an argument to the *highest*, for condescension towards the *lowest*. But thus
our

our Saviour pleads *his* example, not looking on himself as a *Slave*, but as a *Lord* and *Master*, as one *into whose hands the father had given all things*. What shall we say then; *That the example of Christ is much more peculiarly fit for Slaves than for Subjects?* God forbid.

So again; in the twentieth of St. *Matthew*, when there was indignation among the Disciples, occasioned by the petition of the Mother of *Zebedee's* children and her sons; our Saviour exhorts them all to humility, *Who-soever will be chief among you, let him be your servant*, *ŷ. 27.* and then sets before them his own example, *Even as the Son of man came not to be ministred unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many*, *ŷ. 28.* where his *Ministry* and his *Death* are not represented as the consequences of a *slavish* condition, but of a *generous* condescension: And the force of the example here is expressly founded upon this, *that the Son of man was chief among them*; he ministred to them therefore not as one *bought in the market for servitude*, but as *chief among them*, and doing the work not of necessity, but of *love*.

From these two instances (and there are more such) it appears, that the example of
our

our Saviour's humility is not urged in Scripture upon the representation of his condition to that of a Slave, but upon account of his being *Lord*, and *Master*, and *Chief*, though he ministred unto others. But to go on :

St. *Paul* was, in his Lordship's opinion, a perfect *freeman*, and a great *contender* for *Civil Rights*; and yet he says of himself that he had a great desire to know $\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\omicron\iota\nu\alpha\nu\iota\alpha\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \omega\alpha\theta\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, *the fellowship of Christ's sufferings*, Phil. iii. 10. but if it was (as his Lordship represents the case) part of Christ's sufferings to *personate a Slave*, how could St. *Paul* pretend to desire the ($\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\alpha\nu\iota\alpha\nu$) fellowship of his Sufferings, who always behaved himself like so free a *Subject*?

But if St. *Paul* a freeborn Subject did *partake in the sufferings* (as it is elsewhere expressed) of Christ, then the Sufferings of Christ can yield his Lordship no argument to say, that Christ was represented as a Slave in Scripture. And pray which of Christ's sufferings prove any thing like slavery to be his condition? He was accused and condemned by false evidence; so was *Naboth*, yet he was no Slave; for he had an estate in land: He was scourged of the *Jews*; so was St. *Paul* three times, and yet he was free born: Nay, the very form and process of our Saviour's trial proves

E

that

that he neither was, nor was taken to be a Slave ; he was tryed before the *Roman* Governour, and so little was it suspected that he was a Slave, or that his *business here* was to *represent* a Slave ; that the great accusation against him was that he pretended to be a *King* : And the *Jews* told *Pilate*, that he was no friend to *Cæsar* if he let so dangerous a man to the Government escape ; all this is doubtless very like the tryal of a Slave ! Let us then look back to his Birth ; he was of the House and Lineage of *David*, as free a family (at least) as any in the Country ; and that the *Jews* were no *Slaves*, you have their own testimony, *John* viii. 33. *We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man : how sayest thou, ye shall be made free ?* His reputed father was of a trade that probably kept him and his family above necessity ; for though our Lord was upon his birth laid in a Manger, yet that happened not through the extreme poverty of his Parents, but through the crowd of people at *Bethlehem*, which was so great that there was no room in the Inn. But suppose the family to have been never so poor, (and rich it certainly was not) yet many free born families are exceeding poor in every Nation. During his childhood he lived with his Parents

rents as other children do; when he appeared in the world, and did things to the astonishment of the *Jews*; many said *is not this the Carpenter's son?* But we do not find that any one suspected him to be a Slave, or enquired who his master was? And yet, had there been room for such a suggestion, the *Jews* who were disposed to upbraid him, and lessen him in the eyes of the people, would rather have said, *Is not this a mere Slave*, than *is not this the Carpenter's son*. Our Saviour himself speaking of his lowest state, says, *The Son of man hath not where to lay his head*: But Poverty and Slavery are two things, and there is a great difference between *having* no money, and being *sold for money in the market*: Besides, Slaves were not to seek where to lay their heads, they were fixed to the houses of their masters, and it was part of their duty to know and to keep their home. Upon the whole; I cannot imagine upon what passages his Lordship builds, when he says in his Book, pag. 65. that our Lord is *pleased frequently to describe his own low estate by the condition of Slaves*; or when he says here (in his Answer) *that the New Testament itself represents* — the low estate of Christ — *by the condition of Slaves*. His Lordship has not thought fit either in his Book or

in his *Answer* to produce *one single* passage where our Saviour does so describe *himself*; and but one passage (which shall be considered presently) from the whole Testament, where it is pretended that he is so described; and that too nothing to the purpose: And yet he makes no scruple to say, *If it be a crime to represent the condition and example of our blessed Lord, as I have done; the imputation of the Accuser* (i. e. ὁ διαβόλος) *falls upon the New Testament, and not upon me*, *Ans.* p. 14. But as great an *Accuser* (or διάβολος) as I am, I wish his Lordship had in this and in other instances shewn no greater disrespect to the holy Scriptures than I have done: The reader sees here how frankly he throws the *imputation* from himself to the *New Testament*; though the New Testament has said *nothing* to give him a pretence for so doing. This is his Lordship's *common* practice, I will give one famous instance; and will venture another charge of *Calumny* for quoting his own words: *I thought it my greatest defence* (says his Lordship) *to shelter what I had said under the name of our common Lord and Master: and rather than express my reason* (mind Reader) *in my own words, I chose rather to make use of his authority, and to say, that, "To apply worldly motives*
" in

“ in the cases mentioned, is to act contrary
 “ to the interests of true Religion, as it is
 “ plainly opposite to the maxims upon which
 “ Christ founded his kingdom* ; whose are these
 words, I beseech you ? His Lordship seems to
 me to say, that the words are *not his* ; and I
 assure the Reader they are *not the words of*
 Scripture : and as they are not the words of
 Scripture, so neither have they the *authority*
 of Scripture, but stand merely upon his Lord-
 ship’s consequential reasonings. I leave his
 Lordship now to account for this passage ; and
 the Reader to consider in what manner his
 Lordship uses the *name of our Lord and Ma-*
ster for a shelter.

I go on to the Bishop’s fourth and last Reason. “ That our Lord voluntarily put him-
 “ self into that low, oppress’d, helpless Con-
 “ dition of a *Servant* ; and never accounted
 “ it his *Infamy*, but his great Glory, to be
 “ so spoken of. *St. Paul* particularly makes
 “ it his Great *Reward*.

His Lordship here truly observes, that our
 Saviour *voluntarily* suffered all that befel
 him. This indeed was the glory of his
 sufferings, that they were not, that they

* *Ans. to Rep. p. 155.*

could not be imposed on him; but he chose them out of pure love and compassion to men. And this one consideration, if duly weighed, might have shewn his Lordship, that our Saviour's sufferings were not like to the sufferings of a Slave; Slaves suffer not *voluntarily*, but out of *necessity*; not out of love to those from whom they suffer, but because they can no way avoid it. This is the *very* circumstance upon which St. *Paul* lays the stress, in that passage referr'd to by the Bishop; and therefore in that passage St. *Paul* considers him not suffering as a *Slave* by the *necessity* of his *condition*, but as the *freest* among men, and suffering nothing but what he *chose* to suffer. This was his *great glory*, this was the ground of his *great reward* and exaltation: and when Christians find him *thus represented* to them in *Scripture*; as suffering every thing for *their sakes* out of his own *free choice*; how can they possibly conceive of him as a *slave*, as one sold into *servitude*, who has no *will* of his *own*, but must endure what the *imperious will* of another thinks fit to lay on him? Yes, his Lordship will say; our Saviour did suffer out of choice; and it was out of choice that he appeared as a slave. And for this he will quote (his only authority) the passage of St. *Paul* to the
Philip.

Philippians, Chap. ii. that he (*Christ*) took upon him the form of a servant, &c.

To quote Scripture by the mere *sound* of words, is to judge of Scripture by the *Ear*, and not by the *Understanding*. In our *English* translation of this passage we have the word *Servant*, for which his Lordship in his book puts the word *Slave* as equivalent to it; and leads his Reader to think that St. *Paul* represents our Saviour as taking on him the form of a *Slave*, *i. e.* of one who is not *sui juris*, but is *bought and sold in the Market* for the service of a private Master: and yet certain it is, that nothing can be more disagreeable to St. *Paul's* sense than this Interpretation of his words. The Apostle was not speaking to Slaves *peculiarly*, and therefore had no occasion (supposing that he could truly have done it) to represent Christ under the form of a *Slave properly so called*: He writes to all the *Servants* (not Slaves) of *Jesus Christ at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons*. And at Ch. ii. he exhorts them, not to bear the hardships of their *servile condition* patiently, but to be *like-minded, to have the same love, to be of one accord, of one mind*. And lest Pride (as it is naturally apt) should prevent their compliance with these Duties, he adds *¶ 3. Let nothing be done thro'*

thro' strife or vain-glory, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than themselves: At *Y.* 5. he says, *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.* And in the following verses he sets forth his example, and shews that he did not τὰ ἑαυτοῦ σκοπεῖν look on his own things, but was content to lay aside his glory, that he might do good to others. This is the Apostle's view; and now let us consider what he says of Christ. Thus he speaks——*who being ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ in the form of God——ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, emptied himself, or voluntarily laid aside that divine form of glory, power and majesty, and took upon himself (willingly) μορφὴν δούλου the form of a Servant.* The form of a Servant is here opposed (not to the form of a Subject, or of a Freeman, but) to the form of God. And I desire his Lordship to consider whether the form of God be so little, so inconsiderable a thing, that the form of a Servant, when opposed to it, must needs signify the form of a Slave properly so called. With respect to God, the very highest Beings are Servants; Servant is the impressed Character of every Creature, as Supreme is the essential attribute of the Creator. When therefore the form of a Servant is opposed to the form of God, it signifies a Servant to God, and not a Slave to

to *Men*. And thus our Saviour himself describes his own Service ; that he *came* to do the *will* of *God* ; nor is there a single Instance to be found (that I know of) where our Saviour appears to be subject to the *will* of *man* like a *Slave*, but his whole subjection lay in *submitting* to the *will* of God his heavenly Father ; for this reason he (who in the beginning was with God, and was God) came down to men, and was made Man. The Author to the *Hebrews*, to shew the great excellency of Christ above the Angels of God, puts this question, *To which of the Angels said he, at any time, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee ?* And again, *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son*, Ch. i. v. 5. This was the excellency of Christ, that he was the *Son* of God, and *heir of all things*, *the brightness of his Father's glory*, and the *express image of his person*, *upholding all things by the word of his power*, v. 3. But Angels were not the Sons of God in the same sense ; they had not the ($\mu\omicron\sigma\phi\eta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$) the brightness of his glory, but were all *Servants*. — *Are they not all ministring spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation ?* v. 14. Here you see that Angels are distinguished from Christ, because he was, *the brightness of his Father's glory*, the

F express

express Image of his person; (ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ;) but they were all *ministring spirits* (ἐν μορφῇ δούλων) *sent forth* (by God) *to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation*. And thus our Saviour, when he laid aside the *form of God*, the *brightness of his Father's glory*, in order to do the *will of God*, and to *minister* to them who were to be *heirs of Salvation*, he then took upon him (μορφῇ δούλου) the *form of a Servant*, i. e. from appearing in the *glory and majesty of God*, as ruler of the Universe; he took upon him that *form* in which he was so to minister, and which is therefore called μορφῇ δούλου. In this sense all Christians, ancient and modern, (Socinians excepted) have understood the Text; and little suspected that the *form of a Servant*, as opposed by St. Paul to the *form of God*, had any relation to the state or condition of *Slaves properly so called*: and, I believe, had any one explained this Text in the *Council of Nice*, as his Lordship has, it would have made the *ears of the Christian Bishops tingle*.

The antient Author *Hermas* in his *Pastor*, proposes this question, *Quare Filius Dei, in similitudine hâc, servili loco ponitur?* The *Pastor* answers him; *In servili conditione non ponitur Filius Dei sed in magnâ potestate & imperio*. And then, after mentioning the *Incarnation*,

carnation, he adds, *Cum igitur corpus illud paruisset omni tempore Spiritui Sancto, recteq; castè laborasset cum eo; nec succubisset in omni tempore: fatigatum corpus illud, serviliter conversatum est, sed fortiter cum Spiritu Sancto comprobatum Deo receptum est* *. Here you evidently see, that the *servitude* of our Saviour was no other than that of his doing the work of God. And this is the obedience which *St. Paul*, as well as this ancient Christian Writer, makes to be the ground of his *exaltation*.

But to go on with the Text; at *ŷ. 8.* *St. Paul* thus illustrates our Saviour's humility: *and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.* His being obedient to death no body can think to be an instance of his likeness to a Slave: but then the *death* of the *cross* perhaps may be thought to bear a near resemblance to the execution of a Slave: And it is true, that crucifixion was not used to the freemen of *Rome*. *Cicero* in his fifth Book against *Verres*, exclaims against the indignity done to the liberties of *Rome*, when *Verres* crucified a *Roman* citizen; but

* In *Mr. Le Clerk Edit. of the Patres Apostolici*, p. 105. Vol. I.

that all other freemen were equally exempted from this punishment, is not true ; it was the punishment used towards those who were movers of sedition in the Provinces, tho' they were not Slaves but Freemen : and our Lord being accused and condemned by *Pilate* upon this head, as affecting the Kingdom, he was carried to the cross because of his *supposed* crime, and not because of his *condition*. I will transcribe the words of *Grotius* to this purpose, and leave his Lordship to disprove them. *Crucem autem irrogatam Christo, tanquam seditionis auctori, verissimè ab aliis notatum est : eam enim pœnam ei crimini statuunt Romanæ leges, ut notat Paulus v. Sent. Tit. 22. pro quâ nunc furcam in pandectis legimus, quippe crucis usu in suppliciis per Constantinum sublato. Exempla crucifixorum seditionis crimine in ipsâ Judæâ & à Varo & à Floro habes apud Josephum, in Matt. cap. 27. v. 26.*

Thus you see this passage of *St. Paul* affords his Lordship no *shelter* for his assertion ; here is nothing that describes our Saviour as *being* in a state, or *appearing* in a state of *slavery*. The Apostle represents him as willingly laying aside the *godlike form* of divine Majesty, and taking upon him, instead of the image of the *power* of God, the *form* and character

racter of a *servant* of God. Besides ; if we consider only the use of the word δᾶλⓈ (*Servant* ;) on which his Lordship's great dependence is ; and which he tells us *had as mean an idea annexed to it* in St. Paul's time, as the word *Slave* has now ; we shall find that it is far from necessarily signifying a *Slave* in his sense, *properly so called* : St. Paul uses it of himself, and the other Apostles, who were not *Slaves*, 2 Cor. c. iv. ῡ. 5. And our Saviour, Mark x. 44. exhorts all his Disciples thus. *Who-soever of you will be chief, let him be πάντων δᾶλⓈ, the Servant of all.* And 'tis evident here, both from the foregoing and following verse, that δᾶλⓈ and διάκονⓈ are equivalent ; and that our Saviour was never any otherwise a δᾶλⓈ, than as he exhorts his Disciples to be, by *ministring willingly* to others for their good : In consequence of this Precept of our Lords, St. Paul says, 1 Cor. ix. 19. *Though I be free from all men, (i.e. no man's Servant or Slave) yet, πᾶσιν ἐμαυτὸν ἐδᾶλωσα, have I made my self a Servant unto all.* Where you see that being a *Servant* in the Christian sense is not inconsistent with *freedom* ; so far from it, that the same Apostle says expressly, Chap. vii. ῡ. 22. ὁ ἐλεύθεροςⓈ κληθεὶς, δᾶλός ἐστι χειρῶν· *he that is called being free, is Christ's Servant.* In the very Chapter of the *Philippians*

lippians to which his Lordship refers, St. Paul uses the verb δαλῶν, to express the obedience of a son to a father, ὧ. 22. so in the parable of the prodigal, the elder son says to his father, πσάῳτα ἔτη δαλῶ σοι. *These many years do I serve thee.* In like manner, the same word is used to express the *service* of love and charity which Christians owe to one another; thus we read Gal. v. 13. *for brethren ye have been called unto liberty, only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δαλῶτε ἀλλήλοις, but by love serve one another.* In this sense 'tis that all Christians are to be δαλοὶ, *servants* to men; and in no other sense was their Master *a servant* with respect to men.

This passage in the Epistle to the *Philippians* being the only one produced by his Lordship for his *strange*, and, until he *invented it, unheard of Doctrine*; and this Text being directly opposite to the Doctrine he would support, and representing our Saviour as taking upon him the *form of a servant* to God, and not of a *Slave* to men; and the word δαλῶ, on which his Lordship builds, being used in Scripture of all Christians, with respect to the service they owe to God, and the love they owe to each other, and therefore not necessarily denoting *a Slave* in this Text of St. Paul to the *Philippians*;

lippians; the Reader must be surprized to hear his Lordship declaring, that to blame *this* Doctrine of his is to *accuse* the *New Testament*, pag. 14. §. 1. To *calumniate the Apostles*, §. 2. To *reproach St. Paul*, §. 3. Nay, to contradict *Christ himself*, §. 4.

I wish his Lordship had used these great names with more respect: But this is his method of appealing to Scripture; and thus it is that *all* his Doctrines are Scripture Doctrines, and *all* his adversaries opposers of Christ and his Apostles.

For my own part, after having considered this matter maturely, and as carefully as I am able, his Lordship's proposition still appears to me *very shocking*, as well as destitute of all support; nor do I know a single Text in Scripture that can be made to speak in its behalf: And whatever his Lordship may think, not only I, but *many* other serious Christians have been long offended at it; and have wondered how his Lordship could be led into *such* an assertion. Our Saviour's behaviour could afford him no ground for it; no one ever acted with a *freer* Spirit; he *came to do the will of God*, and not to be *subject* to the *will* of man; he came to do good to men, and to suffer for them, and therefore submitted to perform the offices of love and charity towards

towards them: Other servitude than this he knew not: Nay, those passages of his Life which carry the greatest appearance with them of the submission to humane Power, are particularly guarded against all suspicions, of what his Lordship now asserts; that he acted the part of a *Slave*: St. *Luke* tells us, he *was subject to his Parents*, Ch. ii. *ŷ*. 52. And yet when his Mother seemed to complain of his carriage, and said, *Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us*; he answered, *wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?* *ŷ*. 48, 49. intimating plainly a freedom in himself, with respect even to the submission due to his Parents, not common to all sons: The same thing appears again, *John* ii. 4, 5. at the Marriage in *Cana of Galilee*.

And though our Lord says of himself that he came to *minister*, yet when he is concerned in civil affairs he does not govern himself by this consideration that he is δαλϑ, *a servant*; but as a *free subject* submits to pay tribute to the Temple, (which *Slaves* in the Bishop's sense could not do, for they had no property); but even here, the question he puts to St. *Peter*, Mat. xvii. 25. shews, that he looked upon himself not as a subject of man, but as the Son of God; and yet that he might not give offence, he consented to pay,

pay with other *Subjects*, from whom in *appearance* he nothing differed ; had he appeared as a *Slave* he had given no offence by not paying ; but that he might comply with the character of a *Subject* under which he appeared, he wrought a miracle to answer the demand, and paid *that* tribute to the Temple, which the *Sea* first paid him as its great Lord and Master.

The case of his washing the Disciples feet, has been already considered.

If we look to his lowest state, when he seem'd to be in the power of his enemies, and at their command, even there we shall find that he acted as a *servant* of God, and not as a *Slave* to man : When the officers, &c. came to seize him, *John* xviii. he offered himself to them ; they astonished fell down to the ground : Again he offers himself ; and *Peter* drew the sword in his defence ; for which our Lord rebuked him, and said, *The cup which my father hath given me, shall I not drink it ?* *Y.* 11. Putting the whole of his submission on this, that it was the *will of God* that he should suffer ; and telling *Peter*, *Mat.* xxvi. 53. that he could have more than *twelve legions of Angels* to assist him, if he thought it proper. *But how then* (says he, *Y.* 54.) *shall the Scriptures of the Prophets* (i.e. the declared will of God) *be fulfilled ?*

And at his tryal he tells *Pilate*, John xix. 11. *Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above.* Is there any thing in all this like being *subject* to the *will* of a man, as a *Slave* bought and sold in the market? I have observed before that all the circumstances of his tryal were such as denoted his appearance to be that of a *Subject*, and not of a *Slave*. And here I rest the argument with respect to his Lordship, having gone through all he offered in his own defence, and overlooking the bitter reflexions cast upon my self; I have returned him *arguments* for *invectives*, *reasons* for his *reproaches*, Χρῖστα χαλκείων.

But before I take leave of this subject; I must add a word with respect to the author of a letter in the *Flying-Post*, Jan. 18. I might very well excuse my self from taking notice of any thing that appears in a paper, which has used me, and many my betters with the utmost indignity: But as the letter comes from an able hand, and is writ in a spirit very different from that of the *Paper* in which it appears, and indeed from that of the Bishop's own, I will endeavour to give the *Author* of it all the satisfaction I can: And as I must acknowledge that the *good* he has said of me, is more than I deserve, so I hope to shew him the same with respect to his censure on me.

This

This Writer says, that my Representation of the Bishop is very *hard* and *cruel*; and that I may agree with him as far as I can, I do own, that if *his* Representation of the Bishop's *meaning* in the *passage* which I *quoted*, be *just* and *fair*, that mine is both *hard* and *cruel*.

The Bishop of *Bangor's* Proposition is this: *The Example of our Lord is much more peculiarly fit to be used to Slaves than to Subjects.* The Author of the Letter says with respect to this proposition, that the Bishop's sense is, *That the example of Christ is more properly urg'd to Slaves than Subjects, in the 2^d Chapter of St. Peter.* He says again, *The dispute, as I said, is, whether this example be more properly urged upon those who are called Subjects, in Y. 13. or those who are called Slaves, Y. 18.* He affirms a third time, "*This is not the question*" — (*i. e.* whether the Example of Christ be fit for all) "But this—— whether in *This Chapter* of St. *Peter*, the example of our Lord Christ, be "more naturally and properly urged upon, "and applied to the people mention'd in "Y. 13. who are *Subjects*, or to those mention'd Y. 18. who are *Slaves*, or *Servants*?" "This is the matter in question." Upon this state of the case he says very justly, *That*

G 2

which

which ever way it be determined, no Body's Ears need to tingle at it.

I desire this Writer now to consider, that his exposition is inconsistent with the Bishop's words, which do not affirm with respect to St. *Peter*, *That the Example of Christ is more peculiarly urged* (by him) *to Slaves, than to Subjects*, but do affirm with respect to the nature of the example it self, *That it is much more peculiarly FIT TO BE urged to Slaves, than to Subjects*. 'Tis true that the dispute he is there engaged in begun about the example as urged by St. *Peter*; but then both sides argue from the *nature* of the example, in order to limit the Application of it by St. *Peter*, and not *vice versâ*; I desire this Writer to attend to the Bishop's own account of his Adversary's view in arguing from the *nature* of Christ's Example, *p. 61.* (how truly he represents it, I enquire not) *But the example of Christ, say you, is more peculiarly fit to be urged to Subjects than to Slaves; therefore CONSEQUENTLY, this Passage* (in St. *Peter*) *in which that example is urged tho' directed to Slaves, yet was designed peculiarly for Subjects*. Here the Reader cannot but observe that the nature of the example is urged, (by the Bishop's own account) in order to fix St. *Peter's* meaning, and therefore,

fore, with respect to the example, the dispute was, not what in fact it was *applied* to by St. *Peter*, but to what it is in its own nature more *peculiarly applicable*. The paragraph in the Bishop's book, from whence the quotation in dispute is taken, begins thus: *It is so far from being true that his example was more peculiarly fit to be recommended to Subjects considered as such, than to Slaves.* (considered as such,) *that I think the VERY CONTRARY to be evident.* The contrary Proposition to which, is what he has truly and fully expressed, in the words which I quoted. And in all this long Paragraph he does not once argue from the Example, *as applied by St. Peter*, but defends his Proposition upon general topics; such as our Lord's *humiliation*, being *compared by himself to that of a Servant*: St. *Paul's* representing him in the same manner, when he says, *he took on him the form of a Servant*: silence of Scripture, which never compares our Lord's state to that of a *Subject*: the circumstances of his last Sufferings, &c. From the nature of the Example thus fixed, his Lordship makes two observations. The first is, that the difference between the condition of *Subjects* and *Slaves* is so great, that the Apostle St. *Peter* MUST be *supposed* to distinguish them. The
second

second is, *that the example of our Lord is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves, by whose condition he is pleased frequently to describe his own low estate, than to Subjects, whose condition is never used to that purpose, &c.*

And he concludes this Paragraph thus: *This I say (i. e. the patient suffering of our Saviour) is particularly proper in their case (viz. Slaves) for this reason, because he is said with respect to his lowest and most miserable condition to have taken on him their form, &c.*

So that *here* the matter in question plainly was, not this,--how St. Peter had apply'd the example——but this—To which of the two cases the example in its nature was more *peculiarly applicable*.

And now let the Author of the Letter, consider whether he has not greatly mistaken the true state of the question; whether the occasion I had to express my great dislike of this passage was *so* very slight; and whether himself has *taken* the pains requisite to *set the Reader right, and to leave him as impartial as a Reader ought to be when he wou'd judge aright*.

I am sure I have a great deal of reason to wish for *my own sake*, that this writer had
read

read with that impartiality which he has express'd so much concern to preserve to others; and that every Reader may see that I had no design to lead him wrong, I will give him the true reason which drew *that* Observation from me.

I did it then;—to give an undeniable instance of the Bishop's *running* into *extremes* thro' opposition; and to induce the reader to consider the true ground upon which the present controversy with the Bishop stands; for this is the case in almost every article of it; his Lordship not content to oppose what is wrong, suffers his zeal to carry him into very unjustifiable *extremes*.

Thus:

1. Because some have laid too much stress upon a *regular succession* of the *Clergy*, and confined the Validity of the gospel institutions to it, without allowing for cases even of necessity;

Therefore——

His Lordship not troubling himself to consider what regard ought to be paid to a *regular succession*, and what not; calls it in contempt, *The invention of men*, * *vain words*, † *niceties*, *trifles*, *dreams*.

* *Preserv.* p. 88. † p. 98. ‡ *ibid.*

2. Because some have claimed such a power of excommunication as is indeed inconsistent with the terms of the Gospel, and the reason of Man ;

Therefore

His Lordship ; not concerning himself to shew the *true* use of Excommunication in the Church of Christ, and thereby to shut out all *false* claims ; exhorts all Christians to act, *without any regard to the outcries of human terror, or the solemn denunciations of any men upon earth* * ; and represents, *human benedictions, human absolutions, human denunciations, human excommunications, as human engines* permitted to *work* for a time (like other evils) by *providence* †.

3. Because some claim an unwarrantable power to the governours in the Church, over particular members :

Therefore,

His Lordship, not endeavouring to shew the just limits of Church power ; declares there is *no* power in the Church, *That no one of Christ's Subjects, more than another, hath authority—to judge, censure, or punish the Servants of another Master, in matters*

* Ibid. p. 99.

† Ibid. p. 101.

relating

relating purely to conscience and salvation ‡.

4. Because some claim an unjustifiable authority to impose articles of faith, and their own interpretations of the Scripture for such, on the Christian People :

Therefore,

His Lordship, not considering that many Christians cannot read, that more of them cannot read the Scriptures without an interpreter, affirms, with respect to all Christians equally, That the Scriptures in necessary points NEED NO INTERPRETER *.

5. Because the authority of the Magistrate in matters of religion has been often abused; and persecutions have been carried on by the pretence of it :

Therefore,

His Lordship, not endeavouring to state the just limits of the Civil Authority in this matter; affirms, that there is *no* such Authority; and that *if any men upon earth have a right to add to the sanctions of Christ's laws——they are so far Kings in his stead, and reign in their own kingdom, and not in his †. i. e.*

‡ Sermon, p. 16.

* Preserv. p. 101.

† Sermon, p. 13.

as he explains it himself in his Sermon, *They so far take Christ's kingdom out of his hands, and place in their own* ‡.

6. Because it had been urged to the Bishop, that temporal encouragements, when rightly applied, do promote true Religion :

Therefore,

His Lordship, rather than allow temporal encouragements, when applied in the best manner, to be of any service to true Religion, frames a *New* definition of Religion, on purpose to throw out temporal encouragements, and affirms ; That the *belief of another world is what ALONE renders our BEST actions RELIGION from whence they flow ; and from whence, when they do not flow, they CEASE to be RELIGION* *.

I call now upon every reasonable man to judge whether I had not *sufficient* and *great* occasion to make the observation I did, of his Lordship's being carried into *extremes* through opposition : And whether I was to blame for choosing an instance out of a controversy of

‡ Ibid. 14. *This Passage was fully considered in an Answer to a Letter sent to the Rev. Dr. Sherlock ; of which the Bishop, in his Answer to the Report, has not thought fit to take any notice.*

* *Answer to the Report, p. 152.*

his Lordship's, in which I had no hand, and therefore the less prejudice : An instance which appeared to me so *flagrant*, that I no more thought the Bishop would *justify* his assertion, than I did, that he would accuse me of *Calumny* for producing his own words.

But his Lordship knows best how to manage his own part of the controversy : if 'tis for his advantage to draw the eyes of the world from the *merits* of the cause, and turn them to *personal* matters, he may go on complaining either *with* or *without* cause. Were I to recriminate, I too could give a catalogue of abuses that have been cast on me by his Lordship and his friends; but I do not think fit *yet* to trouble the world with them; and therefore will only give one instance of his Lordship's *Charity* towards me; which I should be glad he would explain : I had said * that the Convocation *cannot, if they will maintain the TRUST reposed in THEM, be silent under such an attack upon the Rights of the Christian Church, and the Christian Magistrate*: What says his Lordship to this? Why truly he says nothing to the *trust* reposed in the *Convocation*; but speaks of some particular *trust* reposed in *me*;

* *Ans. to a Letter sent to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, p. 52.*

and says, " I do not at all doubt the truth of
 " what you say, *p. 52.* that *you could not*
 " *have been silent* in Convocation upon this
 " occasion, *if you would maintain the trust*
 " *reposed in You* *.

In the first place, I had said nothing of a-
 ny *trust* reposed in me particularly, and there-
 fore his Lordship is very injurious in repre-
 senting it to the world as if I had. Second-
 ly, His Lordship here allows that I acted ac-
 cording to the *trust* reposed in me; but he
 complains often of the Lower House of Con-
 vocation for treating him ill, and therefore
 not according to the *trust* reposed in *them*;
 from which 'tis evident that his Lordship's in-
 tention here was to charge me with a *private*
 underhand *trust*: And indeed he took care to
 fix his meaning so as not to be mistaken by any
 reader; for at *p. 92.* he says, " I will never suf-
 " fer upon any account in the world ANY SUCH
 " TRUST to be *reposed in me* as can oblige
 " me to attempt, or assist, or encourage in
 " any degree, in any time to come, the like
 " usage of *you*, or of any man living". Here
 'tis plain beyond contradiction, that by the
trust reposed in *me*, his Lordship did not

* *Postscript* to Sykes, *p. 87.*

mean a trust *common* to him and me, as Members of the Convocation ; but some private and particular trust ; and that too a very *dishonest* one, else he would not have said, that he would never upon any account in the world suffer *such* a trust to be reposed in *himself*. This is a reflexion which touches to the quick, which dives into the very heart, and fixes the imputation of *dishonesty* there ; 'tis all *invention*, and I call upon his Lordship to shew any reason that could move him to suggest to the world that I am so *base*, so *profligate* —

I have not perhaps in this controversy treated his Lordship with all that *deference* and *submission* which he and his friends expect from me ; but if all I have said, put together, amounts to any thing *like* this reflexion, which at once takes away the reputation of *honesty* and common morality ; I will humble my self to him in the eyes of the world, and publickly ask his pardon.

As to the *numerous misrepresentations* * ; the new heap of self contradictions ; p. 7. the various and contradictory windings, p. 21. the partial and unjust representations, p. 22.

* Answer to Calum. p. 1.

which

which his Lordship in the abundance of his liberality has bestow'd on me in his last little piece ; all that I have to say is this, that since his Lordship knew me to be so *weak*, so *ignorant* a writer, so apt to contradict and misrepresent even *myself*, methinks, when he thought himself misrepresented by me, common *humanity* shou'd have led him to charge me rather with *ignorance*, than with *calumny*.

As to his Lordship's complaint that I did not answer every thing writ against me, before I pretended to step out like a *new writer*, p. 4. I am surprized to hear it from his Lordship, who has *discretion* enough to let some things go unanswer'd ; and particularly Mr. *Law*'s two letters ; a writer so considerable, that I know but *one* good reason why his Lordship *does not* answer him. But

The Bishop is at liberty to write as he thinks fit, and so am I. If his Lordship expects that I should answer what Mr. *Sykes* and others are at leisure to write, or even *all* that his Lordship has inserted in his large Answer at *second* hand from Mr. *Sykes*, without taking the least notice of what I had published in my own vindication ; he is a very hard task-master, and I must complain of him in the words

words of the *Slave* in *Terence*, who had been sent upon a long fruitless errand, only to keep him out of the way

Edepol næ meam herus esse operam deputat parvi precî.

F I N I S.



PAge 24. Line 17. after *immediately*, add *within a Verse or two.*

**BOOKS printed for J. PEMBERTON at the
Buck and Sun over against St. Dunstan's
Church in Fleetstreet.**

1. **A** Sermon preach'd before the Queen at St. James's, Jan. 31. 1703-4.
2. A Sermon preach'd before the Sons of the Clergy at St. Paul's, Dec. 5. 1710.
3. A Sermon preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor, &c. at St. Paul's, Nov. 5. 1712.
4. A Sermon preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons, at St. Margaret's Westminster, March 8. 1714.
5. A Sermon preach'd at the Temple Church, Nov. 20. 1715.
6. A Sermon preach'd before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, at St. Mary-le-Bow, Feb. 17. 1715.
7. A Sermon preach'd before the Honourable the House of Commons, at St. Margaret's Westminster, June 7. 1716.
8. A Sermon preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor, &c. at the Parish-Church of St. Bridget, on Tuesday in Easter-Week, April 23. 1717.
9. An Answer to Mr. Sykes's Letter to the Rev. Dr. Sherlock; relating to his Sermon preach'd before the Lord-Mayor, November 5, 1712. To which are added, some Observations upon the Account the Lord Bishop of Bangor has given of his intended Answer to the Representation of the Convocation. The Third Edition. Price 1 s.
10. Some Considerations, occasion'd by a Postscript from the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor to the Reverend the Dean of Chichester, offered to his Lordship. The Second Edition. Price 1 s.
11. A Vindication of the Corporation and Test-Acts. In Answer to the Bishop of Bangor's Reasons for the Repeal of them. To which is added a second Part, concerning the Religion of Oaths. The Second Edition. Price 1 s. 6 d.

All written by Thomas Sherlock, D. D. Dean of Chichester, and Master of the Temple.

502.a 12

Ca dono datum, Thoppili, Thomee Tulli,

P. Hengrave

